## RESTRICTIVE COVENANT TERMINATION REVIEW SHEET

CASE: Cl4-75-042(RCT1)- Loyola Landing
ADDRESS: 6651 Ed Bluestein Boulevard

## DISTRICT: 1

OWNER: $\quad 3$ S \& D Interest (David Kalisz)
AGENT: A. Glasco Consulting (Alice Glasco)
ZONING: Tracts 1A and 1B; LO; Tracts 2A and 2B: SF-3
Z.A.P. DATE: March 20, 2018

AREA: 23.25 acres

## SUMMARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the restrictive covenant termination.

## ZONING AND PLATTING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

March 20, 2018:

## ISSUES:

The proposed restrictive covenant termination (RCT) would eliminate requirements tied to a 1975 zoning case (City File \#C14-75-042). Please refer to Exhibit A (Restrictive Covenant). Several other RCTs and one restrictive covenant amendment (RCA) are also being processed concurrently with this RCT request. Removing/modifying these restrictive covenants (RCs), would allow consolidation of the parcels for redevelopment. These are being processed under the following City File numbers: C14-75-042(RCT2), C14-76-083(RCA2), C14-84-346(RCTI) and C14-84-346(RCT2). Please note that C14-75-042(RCT1) is for a separate RC that was attached to the same 1975 zoning ordinance, C14-75-042 (RCT2) applies to different tracts that were also part of the 1975 zoning ordinance. Using multiple RCs with a single zoning case is no longer standard City of Austin practice. Please refer to Exhibit B (RCT Map Exhibit).

A rezoning request is also being processed concurrently with this request; the request would rezone the tracts affected by these restrictive covenants to GR-MU and CS. (City File \#C14-2008-0006).
By terminating the restrictive covenant ( RC ), the Applicant proposes removing the following requirements:

1. No building higher than 25 feet shall be erected on the subject property as provided for in section 45 -1 of the Code of the City of Austin as it existed in 1975.
2. If any lot carved out of the LO tract is developed with apartments, the permitted density thereof shall not be greater than that allowed by (MF-3) zoning.
If the RCT is approved and the rezoning request for GR-MU is granted, the new maximum building height would be $60^{\circ}$. If the RCT is approved but the rezoning is not granted, the height limits would be $35^{\prime}$ on the SF-3 tracts, and 40 ' or 3 stories on the LO tracts. Please note that only one zoning district has a 25 'height, W/LO. All other zoning districts begin with a height of $35^{\prime}$. If the RCT is approved and the rezoning request for GR-MU is granted, the new maximum height would be $60^{\prime}$. If the RCT is approved but the rezoning is not granted, the height limits would be $35^{\prime}$ on the SF-3 tracts, and 40' or 3 stories on the LO tracts. Please note that only one zoning district has a $25^{\prime}$ 'height, W/LO. All other zoning districts begin with a height of 35 ', including SF-3. If the RCT is approved and the rezoning request for GR-MU is granted, the maximum multifamily density would be closer to MF-4 density. If the RCT is approved but the rezoning is not granted, this limit would be irrelevant since neither SF-3 or LO permit multifamily land uses. Please see Exhibit C (Applicant Correspondence).

## DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The tracts affected by this RC are generally located northeast of the intersection of US 183 and Loyola. Tracts 1A and 2A are located near the northeast portion of the proposed rezoning. To the immediate north is an undeveloped property zoned GR. Also to the north is a residential neighborhood that is zoned SF-3. This neighborhood is primarily developed with duplex residences and LBJ High School. Other tracts to the north are under the same ownership as the subject property; these undeveloped tracts are the subject of the related cases referenced in the Issues Section. These are zoned LO, MF-3, and SF-3. Immediately to the east is a small tributary to Walnut Creek that has 100 -year floodplain and a 200' wide creek buffer centered on the tributary. Any site development in this floodplain/buffer area would be extremely limited. East of the tributary is undeveloped land zoned SF-2-CO. Further east, across Millrace Drive, is more of the residential neighborhood, which is mostly zoned SF-2, with a few SF-3 properties as well. This area is developed with duplexes and single family residences. Southeast of the property are parcels zoned $P$ that are developed with park/open space features. Further south, across Loyola Lane, is land zoned LI-NP. Most of the LI-NP land is undeveloped, but there is also a church on the site. To the west of the rezoning tract is Ed Bluestein Boulevard. Further west is land zoned GR-MU-CO-NP, GR-CO-NP, SF-2-NP, GR-MU-NP, and GR-NP. These tracts are a mix of undeveloped land, single family residences, multifamily, convenience store/gas station, and fast food restaurant. Staff has received correspondence from LBJ Neighborhood Association supporting the rezoning, RCTs and RCA. Please see Exhibit D (Neighborhood Correspondence).

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the restrictive covenant termination. The requirements that would be removed were not standard City requirements in 1975, but are now standard requirements. The existing restrictive covenants are a patchwork of outdated requirements that make cloud the property title and make regulatory application confusing. Applying current City Code would be more consistent with City policy and other new developments in the area.

## 1. The proposed zoning should promote consistent and orderly planning.

The requirements that would be removed were not standard City requirements in 1975, but are now standard requirements. The existing restrictive covenants are a patchwork of outdated requirements that make cloud the property title and make regulatory application confusing. Removal of these conditions would allow the area to be developed in a cohesive manner.

## 2. The proposed rezoning does not grant an unequal benefit to the landowner.

Removal and/or modification of the restrictive covenant will make the property subject to current City codes and regulations, which is more in line with properties in the vicinity and City overall.

EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USES:

|  | ZONING | LAND USES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site | GR, LO, MF-3, SF-3 | Undeveloped |
| North | SF-2, SF-3, MF-3, LO | Undeveloped, Duplex, Single family, LBJ High School |
| South | P, LI-NP | Parkland/ open space, Undeveloped, Religious assembly |
| East | SF-2, SF-3 | Undeveloped, Duplex, Single family |
| West | GR-MU-CO-NP, GR-CO-NP, <br> SF-2-NP, GR-MU-NP, GR-NP | Ed Bluestein Boulevard, Undeveloped, Single family, <br> Multifamily, Convenience store/gas station, Fast food restaurant |

## NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS:

Senate Hills Homeowners’ Association
Austin Innercity Alliance
Del Valle Community Coalition
East MLK Combined Neighborhood Contact Team
University Hills Neighborhood Association

Friends of Austin Neighborhoods
Neighbors United for Progress
East Austin Conservancy
University Hills Neighborhood Plan Contact Team
Austin Neighborhoods Council

LBJ Neighborhood Association
Homeless Neighborhood Association
Claim Your Destiny Foundation

## CITY COUNCIL DATE/ACTION:

April 12, 2018:
ORDINANCE READINGS: $1^{\text {st }} \quad 2^{\text {nd }} \quad 3^{\text {rd }}$
CASE MANAGER: Heather Chaffin
e-mail: heather.chaffin@austintexas.gov

Friends of Northeast Austin
SELTexas
Black Improvement Association

## ORDINANCE NUMBER:

PHONE: 512-974-2122
the state of texas COUNTY OF TRAVIS

1-16-8958 KNOT ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:

THAT WHEREAS 62.101 Ltd., a Texas limited partnership oof which Douglas Duwe is the, and the only, general partner), is the owner of that certain tract of land of 13.97 acres more or less (said 13.97 acre tract being hereinafter called the Subject Property) out of the J. C. Tinnehill League, in the City of Austin. Travis County, Texas, said tract of 13.97 acres more or less the Subject Property) being more particularly described on Exhibit $x$ attached hereto and made a part hereof; and,

WHEREAS, the Subject Property, along a portion of its boundary, adjoins a portion of the boundary of that certain tract of land of 5.06 acres more or' less (said 5.06 acre tract being hereinafter called the A Strip) out of the J. C. Tannahill League, in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, said tract of 5.06 acres more or less (the A Strip) being more particularly described on Exhibit $Y$ attached hereto and made a part hereof and =aid a Strip being owned by said 62.101 Ltd.; and,

WHERBAS, as a condition to the rezoning of the subject. Property "O" Office, First Height and Area, under the zoning ordinance of the city of Austin, Texas; and for the better development of the Subject Property, the City Council of the City of Austin, desires that 62.101 Ltd. make, execute and deliver for the benefit of the city of Austin, a municipal corporation, the following restrictive covenant;

NOW: THERPFORE, 62. 101 Ltd., owner of the Subject Property, does hereby place upon and charge the Subject Property (the 13.97 acre tract described on Exhibit $X$ hereto) with the following restrictive covenant which, subject to the following provisions hereof, shall. be deemed a covenant running with the land for the benefit of the city of Austin and binding -upon 62.101 Ltd., its successors and assigns, to wit:
$\qquad$
3. No building higher than 25 feet shall be erected on the Subject Property theight of a building for these purposes shall be computed as provided in Section 45-1, "Height of Building", of the Code of the city of Austin as same exists May 1, 1975; provided that parapet walls, chimneys, cooling towers, water towers, scenery lofts, elevator bulkheads, fire towers, gas tanks, airconditioning or heating equipment, ornamental towers, monuments, cupolas, domes and spires and necessary mechanical appurtenances on a roof shall be excluded in determining height).
2. If any lot carved out of the Subject Property, or the Subject Property itself if not divided into two or more lots, be developed with apartments, the permitted density thereof shall not be greater than allowed by "BB" Residence, First Height and Area, zoning as defined in the zoning ordinance of the city of Austin as same exists Hay 1, 1975; provided, however. that in determining density for purposes of such restriction hereby imposed, the area in the part of the said A Strip (the 5.06 acre tract described on Exhibit $Y$ hereto adjoining any lot carved out of the subject Property (or the area in the entire said A Strip, in case the Subject Property not be divided into two or more lots) shall be included and counted as a part of the area of such lot which it adjoins (or of the Subject Property in case the Subject Property not be divided into two or more lota).
3. Prior to the issuance by the city of Austin of a building permit (for any building which could not be built if it were on . property in the city of Austin, which was zoned "A" Residence under the zoning ordinance of the city of Austin as the same exists May 1, 1975) in respect to any lot (carved out of the Subject. Property) which adjoins the said A Strip, the Director of planning of the City of Austin shall have approved an appropriate landscape plan for the said A'Strip (such plan to call for natural condition substantially as at present and to be generally as outlined in the schematic drawing of the applicant which is on file at the planning

Department of the City of Austin in its zoning case file No. clue-75-042; the A Strip may have utilities) : and such approval by the Director of planning shall not be unreasonably withheld; such approval shall be conclusively deemed given if the Director of Planning states in writing that he has approved such plan; the owner of the lot in question may appeal any denial or refusal of such approval to the planning Commission of the City of Austin.
4. On any given lot which may be carved out of the subject Property, if such lot adjoins any of the said A Strip no occupancy permit (for any building which could not be built if it were on property in the City of Austin which was zoned "A" Residence under the zoning ordinance of the City of Austin as same exists May 1 , 1975 ) shall be issued by the city of Austin for such lot unless the landscape plan.referenced in numbered paragraph 1 hereof above has first been implemented on the particular segment (of the said $A$ Strip) which adjoins the said given lot in question; such implementation shall be conclusively presumed to have occurred if the Director of Planning of the City of Austin signifies in writing that he finds such implementation to have occurred on such segment of said A Strip, and said Director of Planning will not unreasonably withhold hiss said signification that such implementation has occurred; the owner of the lot in question may appeal any denial or refusal of signification that such implementation has occurred to the Planning Commission of the City of Austin.
5. If the Subject Property is hereafter divided into separate lots, this restrictive covenant will be applied on an Individual lot basis, to each respective individual lot severally. If the Subject Property is not hereafter divided into separate lots, this restrictive covenant will apply to it as if it were all one lot (until it is divided into separate lots, at which time the applecation will be on an individual lot basis, severally as to each respective individual lot).
6. If the office of Director of planning of the city of Austin should be abolished or vacant at any time, then the official
of the city of Austin then performing the majority of the functions now assigned to the said Director of Planning shall act for purposes of these restrictions in lieu of the Director of Planning, and the written certification or opinion of the city Attorney of the City of Austin (or an Assistant City Attorney) as to the identity of such eubstitute official for purposes of these restrictions may be relied upon for purposes of complaince with these regtrictions by the Owner of the lot in question (or of the Subject Property), his heirs, assigns, mortgagees, tenants or contractors, andfor by any city of Austin official who issues a building permit or occupancy permit.
7. This restrictive covenant can be enforced by, and only by, the city of Austin.
8. If any person or persons shall violate or attempt to violate the foregoing restriction and covenant, it shali be lawful for the City of Austin, a;municipal corporation, its successors and assigns, to prosecure proceedings' at law, or in equity, against the person or persons violating or attempting to violate such restriction or covenant, and either to prevent him or them from so doing or to collect damages for such violation.
9. The restrictive covenant can be amended by joint action of the city of Austin (acting pursuant to majority vote of a quorum of the city Council of the City of Austin, or of such other governing body of said city as may succeed its City Councily and the then owner of the particular lot in question out of the subject Property.
10. Any buit brought to interpret or enforce this restrictive covenant, or to determine the validity, as reasonable or otherwise, of any failure or refusal to approve the landscape plan or to find same has been implemented as above provided, shall be brought in a District Court in Travis, County, Texas.

EXECUIED this $\square$ day of


BEFORE HE, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared DOUGLAS DUWE, a member of the partnership fo 62.101, LTD. known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged to me that the same was the act of the said 62.101, LID., a limited partnership, and that he executed the same as its General Partner and as the act of such partnership and for the purposes and consideration therein expressed. Duly given under my band and seal of office this 17 day of Hint $^{2} / 1975$.

NOTARY SEAL
Thuinut buchaid Notary public in and for

Exhibit $\times$<br>FIELD NOTES

FIELD NOTES FOR 13.97 ACRES OR LAND, OUT OF THE J.C. TANNEAILL LEAGUE IN THE CTTY OF AUSTIN, TRAYIS COUNTY, TEXAS, SAME geImg out of and a part op that certain tract of land des CRIBED IN A DEED TO L.D. TURNER OF RECORD IH VOLDME 611 AT PAGE 253 OF THE DEED RECORDS OF TRAVES COUNTY, TEXAS, SAIÓ 13.97 ACRES OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED BY METES AND BOUNDS AS FOLIONS:

BEGINNING for reference at the northeatt corner of the said Turner tract, which point is in the west line of block $B_{0}$ Crystalbrook Section Two, a subdivision of record in Dook 59 at Page. 100 of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas;
-TIENCE, with the north line of the said. Turner tract, as9* $56^{\prime}$ W 667.33 feet to a point and N59' 461 W 359.67 feet to a point in the centerline of a proposed street:

THENCE, With the said centerline of a propased street, s30" $11^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{H} 65.00$ feet to the northwest corner and paint of beginning of this tract:

THENCE, with a line sixty-five (65) feet south of and parallel to the said north line of the Turner tract, $559^{*} \mathbf{4 6}^{\circ} E$. 250.00 feet to a point:

THENCE, 516* $02^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ 90.00 feet to a point, and $\mathrm{N} 76^{*} 27^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ 90.00 feet to a point in the said line 65 feet south of and parallel to the north line of the Turner tract;

THENCE, with the said line 65 feat south of and parallel to the north iine of the Turner tract, $559^{\circ} 56^{\circ} \mathrm{E} 697.41$ feet to a point in a line 150 feet west of and parallel to the east line of the said Turner tract, which point is the northeast corner of this tract;

THENCE, with the gaid line 150 teet west of and parallel to the east line of the Turner tract, $829^{\circ} 52 \mathrm{~W} 110.00$ feet to a point:

THENCE, S11" 56 'E 90.00 feet to a point in a line 90 feet wost of and parallel to the east line of the Turner tract;

THENCE, with the paid line 90 feet west of and parallel to the nast 11 nc of the Turner tract. s29. 52 k 8.92 feet to a point and $531^{*} .02 \times N 121.08$ feet to a point:

THENCE, S81* 05* $45,00^{\prime}$ Ieet to a point in a line 125 feet west of and parallel to the east line of the Turner tract:

## FIELD NOTES <br> PAGE THD

TUENCE, with the said line 125 feet west of and parallel to the east line of the Turner tract, $530^{\circ} 02^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} 60.00$ feet to a point,

THENCE, 514* 52'E.85.00 feet to a point in a line 65 feet west of and parallel to the east line of the Turner tract;

THENCE, with the said line 65 feet west of and parallel to the east line of the Turner tract. 530*.02"W 463.48 feet and 530* 40 ! W 95.00 feet to a point;

THENCE, S69" $22^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{H} 40.00$ feet to a point in a inne 90 feet west of and paraliel to the east line of the Turner tract;

THENCE, with the said line 90 feet west of and parallel to the past line of the Turner tract, $530^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \mathrm{W} 65.00$ feet to a points

THENCE, S22' $^{\prime} 27^{\prime} \mathrm{E} 50.00$ fect to a proint in e line 50 feet west of and paraliel to the east line of the furner tract;

THENCE, with the said line, 50 feet west of and paraliel to the east line of the Turner tract, $530^{\circ} 10^{\circ} \mathrm{H} 28^{\circ} 5.00$ feet to a point;

THENCE, $574^{\circ} 17^{\prime} \mathrm{W} .119 .8 \mathrm{feet}$ to a point in the centerline of a creek, which point is the most southerly corner of this tract;

THENCE, with the said centerline of a creek, N1e. 30'w 80.00 feet to a point, $36^{\circ} 30{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{h} 90.00$ feet to a point, and N30* $00^{\prime} \mathrm{W} 182.20$ feet to a point in the canterline of a proposed street;

THENCE, with the gaid centerline of a proposed etreat, N51* 31 ' E 270.24 feet to the point of curvature of a curve whase intersection angle is 21 : 29 ", whose radius is 800,00 feet and whose tangent distance 15 151.76 feets

THINCE, continuing with the centerline of a proposed etred along baid curve to the left, an arc distance of 299.96 fedt, the chord of which arc bears N40 $46{ }^{\prime} E 298.21$ feet to the point of tangency of sald curver

THENCE ${ }_{\text {c }}$ continuing with the centerline of a propojef,
 whose intersection angle is $89{ }^{\circ}$ 5 ${ }^{\prime}$ ', whone radlus is 80.00 ftet and whose tangent distance is 79.95 feet,

THENCE, continuing with the centerline of a proponed strest, alonq said rurve to the left; an arc alstance of 125.62 faet. the chord of which arc beara $114^{\circ} 57^{\circ} \mathrm{H} 133.10$ feet to the point of tangency of said curve;




N subject tract


ZONING

This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries

# ALICE GLASCO CONSULTING <br> 3571 Far West Blivd., PMB 61 <br> Austin, Texas 78731 <br> 512-231-8110 Office 

January 11, 2018

Mr. Greg Guernsey, Director
Planning and Zoning Department
505 Barton Spring Road, Suite 500
Austin, Texas 78704
RE: Restrictive Covenant Termination - C14-75-042(RCT1)

## Dear Greg:

1 am representing 3S\&D Interests (David Kalisz) as it relates to the termination of this 1975 restrictive covenant. The termination of the restrictive covenant will allow the entire property to have similar zoning and comply with current regulations.

## Background:

The land area covered under zoning case number C14-75-042 (ordinance no. 750724 -B) comprised of approximately 62.10 acres. A total of two restrictive covenants were recorded under this 1975 zoning case: document number/volume 5240, pages 865-875 pertains to 13.97 acres and 5.06 acres is zoned LO and SF-3, respectively; while document number/volume 5240, pages $876-884$ covered 42.67 acres and 0.40 acres and is zoned GR and SF-3, respectively.

On February 12, 2015, a restrictive covenant for 15.69 acres, under case number C14-75075 (RCA3), was amended by the City Council to remove all restrictions called out in the document.

The conditions listed in document number/volume 5240, pages 865-875 are as follows:

1. No building higher than 25 feet shall be erected on the subject property as provided for in section 45-1 of the Code of the City of Austin as it existed in 1975.
2. If any lot carved out of the LO tract is developed with apartments, the permitted density thereof shall not be greater than that allowed by (MF-3) zoning.

Mr. Greg Guernsey
Restrictive Covenant Termination - C14-75-042 (RCT1)
3. A non-residential (LO) lot that adjoins the SF-3-zoned strip must have an approved and appropriate landscape plan prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. Any lot carved out of the LO tract and adjoins the SF-3-zoned strip must have an implemented landscape plan prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
5. If the LO tract is divided into separate lots, the restrictive covenant will be applied on an individual lot basis.
6. If the office of the Director of Planning of the City of Austin should be abolished or vacant at any time, then the official of the City of Austin then performing the majority of the functions now assigned to the said Director of Planning shall act for purposes of these restrictions in lieu of the Director of Planning.

## Justification Restrictive Covenant Termination

- The proposed use is multifamily housing and retail.
- All future development will be required to comply with applicable development regulations and standards, which includes zoning and landscaping requirements.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,


Alice Glasco, President
AG Consulting
Cc: David Kalisz
Heather Chaffin, Zoning Planner

Attachments

# LBJ Neighborhood Association 

February 10, 2018

Dear Mayor Adler, Mayor Pro-Tem Tovo, Council Members and Zoning and Platting Commission Members

Re: Loyola Landing

On Thursday, February $8^{\text {th }}, 2018$, Ms. Glasco attended the LBJ Neighborhood Association meeting to give a presentation about a rezoning request and five restrictive covenant termination applications for 6651 Ed Bluestein Blvd. and 5601 Durango Pass. The LBJ Neighborhood Association supports the applicant's zoning change request and restrictive covenant terminations as follows:

## Rezoning Case no. C14-2018-0006:

Tract 1: from GR/LO/MF-3/SF-3 to GR-MU

## Tract 2: from GR to CS-MU

## Lazy Creek Road Extension:

We understand that the City's transportation staff is requiring the extension of Lazy Creek Drive as a condition of rezoning. Since we, as residents, cannot determine what the pros and cons are of extending Lazy Creek Drive to Ed Bluestein Blvd. at this time, the LBJ Neighborhood Association would like to request that the consideration of whether to extend Lazy Creek Drive be deferred to the next stage of development when the developer will have a site plan and a Traffic Impact Analysis submitted to the city.

We are concerned that extending Lazy Creek Drive would encourage drivers from US Highway 290 East to cut through our neighborhoods. Therefore, waiting until the site development stage to look at whether the extension of Lazy Creek Drive makes sense will help the residents of Crystal Brook, Las Cimas, and Northridge determine what the implications are of extending this road to Ed Bluestein Blvd.

Mayor Adler, Mayor Pro-Tem Tovo, Council Members and Zoning and Platting Commission Members

Re: Loyola Landing Page 2

## Termination of Restrictive Covenants Cases:

1. C14-84-346 (RCT1)
2. C14-84-346 (RCT2)
3. C14-76-083 (RCA2)
4. C14-75-042 (RCT1)
5. C14-75-042 (RCT2)

We support the termination of the five restrictive covenants because we believe any proposed development should be required to comply with current city regulations. Please feel free to contact me at 512-426-1622 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

$$
2 / 10 / 2018
$$

$\frac{X \text { Jack Nottingham }}{\substack{\text { Jack Nottingham } \\ \text { V/P }}}$

Jack J. Nottingham, Vice President
LBJ Neighborhood Association

